3e

Council of Planning Librarians

EXCHANGE BIBLIOGRAPHY

December 1967

36

AN INDIVIDUAL REVIEW OF CURRENT PLANNING LITERATURE

Professor John W. Dyckman
Department of City and Regional Planning
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
JAN - 2 1968
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

http://www.archive.org/details/individualreview36dyck

INTRODUCTION

By Charles H. Shain
President
Council of Planning Librarians

Professor Dyckman taped the following speech for presentation at the 1967 annual conference of the Council of Planning Librarians in Washington, D.C. on September 30th.

Although his speech appears to be a single reply to a very broad question, there was actually a modicum of exchange between Professor Dyckman and myself, not immediately apparent on the tape. When I had a question or a comment, Professor Dyckman stopped the tape, and we discussed the matter. Such exchanges were incorporated into the tape.

Using the typescript of the first interview, Professor Dyckman edited his original remarks. This edited talk was presented at the CPL Conference, and now appears in the following bibliographic essay. Bibliographic citations were established later by myself.

Judging by the response of those present at the CPL Conference, and a subsequent review of the text, I believe that this presentation is a broad contribution to the field of planning librarianship, which should call forth replies beyond the present moment. I hope that we may present similar bibliographic essays in the CPL Bibliographies program, from time to time, and all are invited to contribute to such a discussion.

Charles Shain: This is Charles Shain speaking. We are about to conduct an interview with Professor John W. Dyckman of the University of California, Department of City and Regional Planning. Professor Dyckman will be speaking on an individual review of current planning literature. The first question that I would ask Mr. Dyckman is, "What are some of the current trends in planning literature that you have observed, whether good or bad, in a general way?"

Professor John W. Dyckman: Well, the answer that I'd give to that question will be as general as the question, but I would hope initially to try to put the changes in planning literature that I have seen in the last several years in some kind of perspective of information management. One thing that strikes the scholar, and I suppose also strikes the librarian or anyone else concerned with attempting to classify or codify planning literature, is that the shifts in interest of the planners are reflected in the shifts in the topics of the published work, with, of course, an appropriate lag of perhaps a few years. While looking through my files recently, I observed that the system of classification which I developed some years ago to hold my assorted pamphlets, monographs, reprints and other pieces, was hopelessly out of date. It's impressive how quickly the early classificatory system had become functionally useless. In city planning we have moved away from a series of conventional subject headings which only recently we all understood very well. For example, I find on my shelves classifications such as Housing, Community Facilities, Utilities and Services, and Transportation. These classifications are gradually being superseded by classifications which better fit the functionalist categories of the Social Sciences. For example, instead of major subject headings such as Housing and Transportation, I now find I am using subject headings such as Cost Benefit Analysis. Also, I find when looking at my classificatory headings that items such as Change and Social Planning, appear in the new headings, replacing headings such as Transportation and Urban Renewal. In other cases there is no substitute heading which nearly approaches the more general social-science-derived headings which are now showing up in the classificatory systems that are being developed in the libraries and in the planning schools. I have not attempted to make a statistical analysis of the drift in any journals, nor have I made any samples of the key words in the titles of articles appearing in journals, but I think that a very casual empiricism reveals that the words being used in the titles of articles have changed substantially in the Journal of the American Institute of Planners and comparable journals in the last few years.

The second point I would make about the changes in the literature is that planning and urban planning stories are appearing in more unlikely places, so that it is necessary now to search a great many more journals and to look, in fact, at some rather off-beat ones in order to find the stories that might reasonably become grist for the mill of the planner. This is interesting to me because a number of journals and magazines which could by no stretch of the imagination have been considered feeders for course reading lists in the past have suddenly become rather important. One of these journals is "Daedalus"[1], the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, which in the last three years has had two special issues and two other peripherally related issues of considerable interest in city planners. And, in fact, the number of articles on city planning or related subjects by city planners appearing in the Daedalus has grown rapidly over the last half dozen years by a rather casual count of author listings.

A second kind of journal is that called "The Public Interest"[2], which is likely to have stories by urbanists and planners and for urbanists and planners. This, again, is a journal which one would not expect to be so professionally oriented, but which is likely, nonetheless, to have material of considerable use to planning professionals without being in any sense a specific professional journal. A third such journal where I have recently found items appearing on my reading list is "Transaction"[3], a journal which is attempting to distill and popularize social science

findings for laymen interested in policy questions, and which has, in the course of doing this, come upon a number of urban questions which it feels to be the proper domain of social science. These questions overlap substantially conventional planning items.

Still another area of major change in the planning literature is represented by the appearance of anthologies, collections and readers. For the first time in the history of higher education in city planning we are beginning to produce a substantial number of text materials. In the past there has been a rather remarkable dearth of textbooks in city planning, and anybody who has served as a librarian for a major city planning faculty knows that the problem of satisfying the reading list requests of its faculty has been a very difficult and tedious one involving the tracking down of journals in very scattered places. But recently there have been a number of developments which have produced texts or reading materials designed specifically for the city planning audience. Among these have been a series of "readers". We have had readers in Regional Planning, the one by Alonso and Friedman[4] being a very prominent example. A new set of readings in comparative planning edited by Wendt Eldridge[5] is shortly to appear and we are hoping soon to see the long awaited series of Ford Foundation sponsored readers which were originally commissioned for the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania under the editorship of the Meyersons. There will surely be more readers in this vein. As a matter of fact, a number have been developed for use in semi-professional--if I may call it that--education, including a set of readings on the metropolis developed by the faculty at UCLA for use in Urban Extension.[6] We may see this number rapidly swelled by new sets of readers on a variety of city planning subjects. As a good example of these I would cite the special issues of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners devoted to one subject, such as the rather widely quoted issue devoted to simulation models in urban planning.[7] All of these efforts represent a move on the part of the faculty to take over some of this kind of librarian chore and put the readings together in one place, and I think librarians in general welcome this tendency.

These same tendencies are matched by the effort to collect pieces for popular or less scholarly readers who are not well acquainted with the developments within the city planning field. Some of the reflections which city planners have on the same problems which concern the layman and other scholars are appearing in such readers. There is a tendency to present the city planning view by either commissioned papers or by taking advantage of tape recorders and other devices to record speeches at meetings and conferences. Both the AIP[8] and ASPO[9] have been issuing such conference proceedings for some time, and most of the talks commissioned for such conferences are hybrids between pure scholarship and the attempt to say something pertinent about an urban problem of the day. They are therefore sometimes difficult to classify. It is also true that in such conferences the speakers may allow themselves greater latitude to float across topics, and so it may be more difficult to categorize the subject matter of their particular talks. One of the better examples of this conference proceeding effort is the AIP Conference under way right now. The first volume of papers commissioned for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Institute has been published in time for this meeting. It is called "Environment for Man",[10] edited by Bill Ewald and published by the Indiana University Press. We may expect another such volume next year after the meetings of the AIP. In the same vein, some of the papers prepared for the AIP by the Center for Planning and Development Research at the University of California under a Public Health Service grant[11] on the same subject of environment for man will be published by the Public Health Service later this year or early next year. There is almost no limit to the publications of this kind which we may expect to see in the near future.

In addition to the publication of conferences there is a new development--a tendency to publish collections of papers considered to be relevant to issues being discussed by subcommittees of the Congress of the United States.[12] In this category one would find the August 1967 publication of the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress entitled "Urban America, Goals and Problems",[13] which was printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee and which has in its slim volume reprints of a number of papers on several urban problems, some of which are economic and some of which are only faintly so, but almost all of which would be of interest to urbanists and planners.

In addition, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has commissioned a number of papers over the last two years. I have been on the Research Advisory Committee of the Chamber to select topics and researchers to do these papers, and I find that they are more interesting than we had expected. Among these publications one would find "The Metropolitan Enigma",[14] a series of essays published last year by the Chamber. These publications are often circulated at the start, at least, to the mailing list prepared for or by various organizations. As these are rarely advertised in the public journals or in the newspapers, access to them takes on a rather chancy and accidental character.

In the same company I ought to mention some reports being put out by various committees in Washington. These reports are designed for consumption by the Congress or by public agencies and only by chance find their way back into the hands of the general public through the Government Printing Office, where they are easily available if one knows to look for them. Among these are the series of reports of the Committee on Water of the National Academy of Science. One of the reports done in this committee, for the Committee on Planning for Water,[14a] has attempted self-consciously to introduce a rather sophisticated planning methodology. A subsequent major publication of that Committee on the Colorado River as a case study in planning methodology will shortly be forthcoming. It's not likely that the planning profession will know about any or all of these in any systematic way as they are now being circulated. It is much easier, for example, to find your way to books published by established publishers who have a vested interest in puffing the story of the book, than it is to come upon these reports, and this has been a chronic problem in planning since the very early days. The various agencies and committees that produce these reports are not likely to be circulating announcements to librarians. Today, the distinctive aspect of this problem is that there are many more such reports.

I was surprised to find that some reports have embedded in them substantial bibliographic reference. One of these bibliographically rich books is found in a report called "Wichita Tomorrow",[15] a report on the Wichita Regional Conference on Local Government Problems and Policies which was originally sponsored by the Brookings Institution. It is surprising to find that in the back, Part 6 of this rather slim report, something called "Materials Studied by Conferees", which is a rather excellent bibliography of planning articles in books not only for the layman but for the college student as well. This kind of source is unexpected and I think we shall find that as the level of sophistication on the part of the lay people and related professionals and scholars on the subject of city planning becomes better developed, we can expect to find such sources being increasingly in evidence, and we will find that the level of bibliographic reference and the level of scholarship in the conventional planning sense which appears in such civic reports, increasingly worth our attention.

It is clear that these anthologies, modest as they are, have had a considerable success in the city planning field. The issue of Scientific American[16] published a few years ago was one of the most successful issues ever published by that magazine. Within a month the entire supply of copies was sold out. A second run was

subsequently sold out. The Scientific American then went to hard cover form and the book has been selling briskly for two years. The title of the book is "Cities".[1] Now, the prestige of publishing in Scientific American permitted the magazine to put together a rather strong cast of contributors and also permitted it the luxury of rather elegant reproduction of materials in the course of the articles--in other words, by the way they appear in the book. But at the same time, I think this is only a symptom of the lively market for publications with a scientific cast, and we may expect to see in the future a steady production of such anthologies. This, of course, raises other problems of indexing and reference to these journals, but I am sure the librarians will develop means of coping with such reference.

So far I have not mentioned the problem of the appearance of material related to city planning which one may find in scholarly journals outside the field of city planning. This is more nearly the classical problem which the faculty member has faced in putting together a course in city planning in the last ten years. Today the problem is, if anything, somewhat more difficult for the very first reason that I mentioned in my remarks today--that is, the problem has become more difficult because the subject headings with which the faculty member would search this related literature have become vastly expanded and substantially altered. To take some examples--in the early days of city planning education it was quite likely that the city planning faculty member looked to relatively few sources outside his own field for materials and these sources were well established by a sound tradition. First the city planning professor looked to ecology literature for what it could tell him about the spatial uses of the city or region. This was a very important source and the principal occasion for the planning professor to venture into the sociological literature and to some extent into the geographical literature. Two things have occurred which make this kind of search less straight forward today. The first of these is the change in the field of ecology itself. For one thing, it occupies a less prominent place in the sociological journals, and ecological articles are more likely to show up in journals that are interdisciplinary than they are to show up in the more conventional sociological journals. This alone throws some researchers off the track. Secondly, the character of ecological studies which are useful to city planning has been expanded so that the planner today may look elsewhere to find the analogues which he wishes to apply to his planning situation. It has become fashionable, for example, for the planner to look at some of the studies of density in rat colonies. This, as you can imagine, is far removed from the direct one-to-one correspondence which was found in the sociological studies of urban ecology.

Once again, labels may deceive the planner or the librarian. For example, a substantial source of studies on issues vital to city planning today can be found in journals of management science. Now this itself represents a substantial shift within the activities and the character of the city planning profession. The fact that such studies will be of value to the city planner is a departure or reflects a departure on the part of the planner from some of his conventional concerns. Journals of management science such as the Public Administration Review[18] are increasingly concerned with tactics and strategies of decision-making. In an earlier, simpler, Golden Age of city planning, it was not necessary to be so concerned with issues and decision-making. This is a rather late and clearly self-conscious development in a professional field. In an earlier era the city planner did what he intuitively knew was right to do. He made his contribution, sometimes humbly, sometimes as an advocate, but he was certainly never in doubt in his technique that his professionalism would guide him in the right direction. The profession as a whole has lost some of its innocence, and with it, some of the confidence of the earlier period. And so it has turned to an examination of the characteristics of decision-making, hoping to take advantage of some of the rather

rapid developments in the theory of efficient decision-making and effective decision-making, and hoping at the same time to apply some of these techniques in the ordinary practice of professional city planning. As a result, planners now occasionally read such journals as The Journal of Management Science[19], and Public Administration Review, and some may ask themselves seriously whether their own decision-making can be improved by the use of techniques described in these journals. In particular, some may even ask themselves the more searching philosophic questions which go to the heart of the decision-making process itself--the question of whether it is better to adopt a strategy of making small changes in elaborate feedback mechanisms or whether it is better to attempt the rather global schemes for which the planning profession has justifiably earned its reputation in the past. The exploration of this literature has cast up a host of subject headings not previously found in the planner's index file or bookshelf.

Books on program budgeting and planning appear in almost every planning office and library today. The program budgeting field, which seems at once to bridge the difficult middle area between the long range plan of the city planner and the short range budget or capital program, has been graced with large numbers of public entries in the past few years. Some of these have been published as the outcome of papers prepared by the Rand Corporation. Perhaps the best known of these publications is a recent volume on program budgeting edited by David Novick and published by Harvard Press.[20] This volume, like so many others that I have been mentioning, is a kind of anthology or collection of individual papers on the subject. Many of these papers refer to the applications of program budgeting to the operations of the Department of Defense, but there is as yet very little in this field which has had its application to the local planning functions. The nearest to this which we have in the available literature that utilizes the approach is a set of studies on measuring the benefit of public investment, edited by Robert Dorfman, again after a symposium at the Brookings Institution.[21] An exception to the rule which I have just set out, is a recent book by Harry Hatry and John Cotton on Program Budgeting for State, County and Local Governments.[22] We may expect in the near future, a whole set of studies emerging in the city planning field which contain somewhere in the title or somewhere in the subheadings, reference to program budgeting by which the connection or umbilical tie with this early literature will be established.

In fact, there is a kind of moral here, and that is, that those articles which are searched out by the professors of planning in their scattered sources early in the stages of the development of an idea in city planning, tend to come together again under slightly new guise in an anthology. Or if they are not actually caught up in a set of readings, they are later reflected in the city planning literature by slightly different titles, clearly derivative. That is, the words and the phrases which are borrowed from these other social science or applied science fields come back to city planning after a short lag, are adopted by the city planners, and are somewhat transmogrified in the course of their use in city planning. One would expect, therefore, that the terminology with which one searches the literature in city planning is itself always undergoing change, and this is the case. I don't know that the terminology of city planning changes more rapidly than the terminology of, say, sociology. But I think, given a number of practitioners in city planning and given a number of published volumes, one may expect that these volumes will have less continuity in city planning, book for book at the present stage of the art, than comparable volumes in a field like sociology.

I am suggesting that if one keeps a record of city planning publications over a length of time, he will observe in that record shifts in the concern of the city planners which are more rapid, more volatile than those which he would find in the established sciences from which city planning most frequently draws.

The language which has perhaps most liberally been borrowed by city planners is that of economics. This is itself a symptom of the growth of economic concerns in city planning. Now, one might argue that city planning has always been concerned with economics or business, but for the first time city planning is concerned with the concepts of academic economics, and this has a very substantial effect on the literature. If one were to look at his library to see all the studies of economics in city planning, he would find that there is a very abundant literature of city planning economic-based studies and various kinds of economics studies, none of which ever come to grips with or even close to any of the conceptual notions of academic economics. This is in part because academic economics was making such a small effort, really very small, to converge on the problem from its side. But now one finds on opening any book or any anthology on city planning, that titles, chapter headings, subheadings will contain words clearly drawn from academic economics. The terminology of the city planners, if not the conceptualization, has in recent times been very dramatically affected by this exposure to economics. Once upon a time, for example, we had in city planning a number of studies on economic base, as I have mentioned, and a host of studies on how to interest private parties in the effectuation of plans. In casually opening a table of contents in a planning book, one sees several articles containing the terminology, "The Role of the Private Sector". This terminology, "private sector", suggests that in addition to being concerned about how the uncontrolled nongovernmental sector of the economy behaves, in addition to being concerned about how private parties implement plans--or do not implement plans, the writers of these articles, many of them city planners, have a conceptual division of the task into private and public sectors which presupposes a kind of accounting scheme, a kind of aggregated accounting reckoning of the community, and I submit that such an aggregated accounting scheme did not obtain in the early days of city planning.

In all this discussion, one might get the impression that traditional books on city planning are no longer to be found. Books on city planning were never very numerous. Many of the books on the city were used by city planners, but with the exception of a few textbooks--the famous books by Lewis which were a brief preparation for civil service examination, the book by Stu Chapin on Land Use Planning,[23] and one or two others--there are historically very few books on city planning as an activity. There were books expressing a city planner's view of the city, most notably those of Mumford, Henry Churchill, and the historic ones of British town planners viewing town and country in England.

Today, we're beginning to find and may increasingly expect to find books dealing with city planning prepared by scholars in fields outside of city planning. Note what I am saying. I am suggesting that whereas much of the book literature in city planning in the past consisted of views of the city by city planners, we are now beginning to get books about city planning written by sociologists, economists and political scientists. That is, as Charlie Shain has remarked, city planning has become a subject for study in other fields. And the production of studies about city planning is often very illuminating to city planners. I think that the planners have gained considerable insight into their own activity from these studies. For example, one of the first of these studies, which only partly qualifies for this category, is a study by Banfield and Meyerson called "Politics, Planning and the Public Interest",[24] which is actually a case study of public housing in Chicago. From that Banfield, a political scientist, went on to conduct a number of studies on decision-making at the local level, often revolving around city planning issues.[25] This tradition has been continued by James Wilson[26] and others, including the Inter University Case Studies Program.[27] To my mind the most illuminating study by a non-city planner of city planning and what it is all about, is a study which might be called a partial sociology

of the planning activity and a partial political study of the decision-making issues in city planning. The book to which I am referring is "The City Planning Process",[28] a political analysis by Alan Altshuler, published by Cornell University Press. This book, like so many others of this type that I am now discussing, was published by a university press, marking it as a scholarly book intended for scholarly use. This particular study by Altshuler draws upon case studies of planning in the Twin Cities in Minnesota and is so illuminating and so insightful that it is likely to be found on city planners' shelves and in city planning libraries for some time to come. In a way, Altshuler has dramatized a tendency which I have mentioned, because he has taken city planning seriously on its own avowed terms. One might expect a fair amount of literature by non-city planners about city planning which do not take city planning at its word. In fact, a certain amount of muckraking about the activities of city planning, particularly urban renewal, has become rather popular in recent years, as witness the "Federal Bulldozer",[29] a work by Martin Anderson. Altshuler's book marks a significant departure because a reputable political scientist is investing a considerable study not only in what, in the behavioral sense, has been done by city planning, but also in what city planners say ought to be done in the cities and what they conceive their own tasks to be. If this has any distinction from other such books, it is simply this: Altshuler takes the city planning problems as stated by city planners in their own terms as serious problems. If this trend continues, and if it is taken up by others, one might expect to see a set of studies in other fields which are, in an indirect sense, commissioned by the city planners themselves because it is the city planners who throw out the problems. It is Altshuler's concern, for example, to come to grips with the issue of comprehensiveness in planning: an issue which is almost inevitably dismissed by non-city planners. Altshuler attempts to find in the case studies and in the theoretical literature of public decision-making, the appropriate place and the appropriate tactics which might be taken for and by the city planner. In fact, I think there is a tendency to consider city planning less professionally untouchable and detached and more clearly political, and I suspect that this will spawn a whole host of books dealing with city planning's political effect. If the politicians believe that city planning is political, one might expect the whole planning profession to benefit from being taken so seriously. If, on the other hand, city planning continues to be treated as a technical and in many respects remote, positivistic, valueless and detached activity, I can anticipate that there will be a clear shift in the publishers and in the publications of city planning. I think, for example, that if city planning achieves the presumed detachment of engineering, that city planning books will likely be published by John Wiley; that if city planning takes on the characteristics of a behavioral science, the city planning books will increasingly show up in the Basic Book series; and that if city planning really becomes a political question, books themselves will become less relevant and city planning will be, as it is beginning to be in some places, the constant subject of articles in "Harper's", "The New Republic", the New York Times Book Section, and so on. So there are, in fact, some shifts in the sources where one might expect to find the most relevant current planning literature, depending on the drift of the profession.

A book was published last year by the MIT Press which argues that the whole hope of city planning is to become politically engagé. That's a book by Leonardo Benovolo, an architecture professor at the University of Venice, and it's called "The Origins of Modern Town Planning".[30] In this book, Benovolo argues that city planning was divorced from political radicalism in 1848, largely by the action of the orthodox Socialists, specifically the Internationale, who considered city planning the aid and comfort of the Utopians, who, at that time, were considered to be a detriment or a possible source of division in the ranks of the Socialist Movement. Certainly one would not argue that city planning in America has socialist roots.

But I am arguing in a book on which I'm working now, that city planning in America has clearly political reform roots, and the question of the changes in city planning as it has drifted away from these reform roots is one of the subjects worthy of special study by itself, quite apart from its impact on the character of the literature. In the early days of city planning, by which I mean the period directly after the codification and organization of the city planning field around 1905, the city planning literature was likely to be found in the midst of the tracts of the reformers, and articles on city planning were often coupled closely with other reform programs. Today city planning articles are more likely to be found in the midst of other articles on management and public administration dealing primarily with efficiency. Today city planning has, with generations of welfare programs, become more clearly bureaucratized, more solidly entrenched in government, more assimilated in the activities of public officials. But the trend, which is barely revealed in these early publications of political scientists, is to restore city planning once again to the public political arena.

The new generation of city planners is attempting to couple efficiency with reform. There is evidence that the city planners have struck some notes to which the social welfare profession is responding. Articles written by city planners are beginning to appear in anthologies of social planning for social welfare students. But in the course of this development the city planner is not going to surrender the efficiency techniques with which he has been operating or attempting to operate in the most recent past. So one might expect to find some new developments in which the city planners attempt to apply these efficiency techniques to the social goals of reform. How this adventure will fare is not at all clear, since the city planners have not succeeded in establishing any social base from which they can operate these techniques with impunity.

This is the point raised by Davidoff and others in their call for advocate planners.[31] In some sense, as Altshuler observed, advocacy is inconsistent with this comprehensive viewpoint. But the argument of the segment of the city planning profession which is calling for advocacy planning, might be interpreted as a bid for the establishment of a silent political base somewhere in the urban community from which reform might safely be mounted. In this particular, these planners are interested in devising or creating new programmatic forms which escape some of the bureaucratic vices ordinarily associated with the efficiency position. One may even expect to find some new journals springing up as these scholars and practitioners begin to effectuate some of their programs or at least to better formulate them. In this connection they would share some of the objectives of a journal like "Trans-action", which has attempted to make social science, in the positive social science sense, more relevant for policy questions, or at least more directly addressed to such questions.

But in general, the great drift in city planning literature which I find in the most recent past is a drift toward the contribution of city planners to social science, and the part of the journals on the one hand, and the drift on the part of social sciences on the other to study city planning problems and to study the city planning profession. Thus we find the city planners passing behavioral scientists on their way to each other's journals. If one picks up the Journal of the American Institute of Planners today he is likely to find a substantial sprinkling of contributions by nonmembers of the profession. This has been a conscious editorial policy on the part of some of the recent editors of the Journal. It also reflects the rising market in the city planning profession for articles and for issues raised by non-planners.

And, on the other hand, as I have suggested, we are increasingly finding reputable behavioral scientists in political science, social science, public administration and business studying city planning problems from the view point of the city planner rather than exclusively from the viewpoint of the behavioral scientist, and I expect that this tendency will also increase.

As a result of this mixture, the task of obtaining an appropriate corpus of strictly city planning literature has become seriously difficult. In fact, each librarian working in a city planning library today is eclectic in a way in which these early professors whom I have described had been eclectic. But the librarian has the advantage today that he has more tools at his command for searching these articles, for searching these relevant points than the professor has had, and in addition he is under less burden to be creative in establishing his analogies. In fact, the whole trend of the field is making it easier for him in this sense, that the social scientists are not afraid any longer to use the language of city planners, and this helps one locate the articles of relevance. The city planners for some time now have been not afraid to use the language of behavioral science, so that the practitioners and students in this field are more likely to be familiar with it. In consequence I think it will be clear, increasingly clear, in fact, what articles are important for the city planner. Of course, there will always be a substantial element of individual choice and of accidental need in this designation of importance, but I would expect to find a growing convergence, once again after perhaps ten years of divergence, in the reading lists and on the library shelves of many of the city planners.

The real problem which you may face, however, is that of budget because of limitations of what you can buy and acquire. There is a money aspect, there is a capacity for cataloging, and there is, of course, the capacity for individuals to read and digest this material. Certainly we are in a period of very great growth.

In the other social science fields, which have experienced this growth for a longer period but not to any greater degree, a new phenomenon has emerged--the phenomenon of the digest, the review. For example, one finds in psychology a special journal devoted to reviews of books in psychology.[32] There is as yet no such journal in city planning. In fact, the editors of such a journal would today be confronted with a very formidable task of prescreening which would be expensive and difficult.

In some ways the existence of a single journal in the city planning field is itself a kind of digest, but no journal can begin to come to grips with these related offerings in different fields and with the contributions of planners to these various fields which I have just described. In fact, the question arises--may we expect to see many more journals in city planning? In the field of psychology, again, there are a dozen major journals, in the field of city planning there is one.

City planners, as yet, do not depend on their published output for the whole of their communication. The field is still small enough so that there is a great deal of informal exchange, papers are exchanged and so on. Indeed we find in all the sciences, the newest work appears first in the form of papers circulated to other scholars rather than actually published.

To make the problem more severe, the last generation of city planners was not given much to writing, and in some cases it was not very fluent at writing. The new generation of city planners now in the schools or recently graduated may be expected to produce a substantially larger volume of output per person than the previous generation, and further, there are more of them. Therefore, I would expect to see a point some ten or twenty years off on the horizon, where an

official effort would be make to secure a kind of ready digest of both the materials relevant to city planning and of the publications of city planning. The question of digesting and the principle to be used in it would, if my earlier remarks were valid, be somewhat simplified by the growing area of common discourse.

It remains to be seen whether there will be any agreement within the profession on the direction which planning should take, because only out of such agreement can these criteria emerge which will serve as the basis of selection or the identification of importance. One obstacle which we have encountered in city planning on the screening of this literature has been the substantial disagreement within the profession on its own proper tasks. Even today, a substantial amount of the material published in the official Journal of the American Institute of Planners is not read or approved by the planning profession. A certain amount of that material is designed entirely for the next generation, which is confronting the task of finding its own road through these related fields. And I would hope that this generation would in some sense be more skillful than the present one at this task.

In this effort to bring some order, the role of the editor is critical. We are fortunate that we have had editors in the city planning field who have undertaken enormous synthesizing tasks. These editors have attempted to bring order out of a wide variety of issues and out of a great confusion of publications. In fact, it may be that city planning is now still so eclectic that we may expect for some time to depend on relatively flexible notebooks guided by such editors. We have had excellent examples in the past. Dennis O'Harrow of the American Society of Planning Officials has, through the Planning Advisory Service Reports,[33] managed to keep in the hands of professional planners some operating notebooks in which, at least, the technical know-how level has continued to produce or provide, new materials, new ideas, and new techniques.

On a more broadly philosophical level, John Osman of the Brookings Institution has been embarked for some time on a rather herculean library project for the Brookings Urban Policy Conferences. At each meeting of these conferences Osman presents the participants with a set of readings culled from a wide variety of sources and including some of the most excellent materials. In each case these materials are xeroxed with the consent of the initial publishing journal or book, and these are assembled week by week in notebook form adding testimony to the variety of relevant materials for urban policy questions. Now in these cases, and particularly in this latter case, the principal burden for assembling and judging relevance and importance falls on the editor or on the organizer. He is aided by his ability to aim toward the over-all purpose of the series in the conference, to outline it, and particularly to choose for each session some discrete policy issue to which these articles are to bring light. I believe that for some time to come, flexible notebooks of this kind or rapidly changing series are likely to characterize city planning activities and are likely to be among the most useful inputs. One might suggest that the whole profession would benefit if some record could be kept, not only of the entries in these various volumes, but of the considerations which entered into the discriminations made by the organizers of such publication series or of such informal workshop material. In the last analysis, however, the most important contribution to this organization of material may yet be made by the city planning librarians themselves. Some of the work of city planning librarians in this area has been impressive.

In view of what I have just said there is no reason for optimism so long as the subject headings themselves keep shifting. But it may be that we are entering a period in which connections between subjects can be more effectively identified and new principles of grouping developed. Certainly the techniques of search are

more highly developed today than they have ever been in the past. If we could have an effective group of producers and users of city planning material analogous to the Users Committee in the census classification, we might be able to give the planning librarians the kind of help in this effort which they have never had. And finally, I hope that the city planning librarians will be able to make this contribution by taking a more active part in the city planning process and in the city planning study. In this connection I think that the librarians of city planning ought to be practicing scholars in the field, working alongside the professional or academic persons, because unless the city planning librarian is more than a librarian, unless he is an active creator in these categories, I think this task is likely to elude him. But this, again, is a very personal view. Thank you.

Bibliography for Professor Dyckman's Speech — Prepared by Charles H. Shain

1 Daedalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Boston, Mass. 1955- Quarterly. $5.50/yr.

Issues cited: Vol. 95, No. 3 (Summer 1966) Tradition and Change.
Vol. 96, No. 3 (Summer 1967) The Year 2000.

2 The Public Interest. National Affairs, Inc., Freedom House, 20 West 40th St., New York, N. Y. 10018. 1965- Quarterly. $5.00/yr.

3 Trans-Action. Social science and modern society. Washington University. Box 1043A, St. Louis, Mo. 63130. 1963- Monthly (except combined Jan/Feb and July/Aug. issues). $7.50/yr.

4 Friedmann, John and William Alonso, eds. Regional Development and Planning: A Reader. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press. 1964. 722 pp., $9.75.

5 Eldredge, H. Wentworth, ed. Taming Megalopolis. New York, (An Anchor Original) Doubleday, 1967. (Vol. 1: What is and what could be. Vol. 2: How to manage an urbanized world.) 1166 pp., $2.45 each.

Also: New York. Praeger. 1967. $9.25 per volume. (Library of Urban Affairs November selection) ...according to Professor Eldredge, letter 6 November 1967.

6 Elias, C. E., et al, eds. Metropolis: Values in Conflict. Belmont, Calif., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1964. 326 pp., $3.95 (paper).

7 American Institute of Planners. Journal. Vol. 31, No. 2 (May 1965). Special issue: "Urban Development Models: New Tools for Planning", Britton Harris, guest editor.

8 American Institute of Planners. Proceedings of Annual Conferences. Washington, D. C., The Institute, 1917- .

9 American Society of Planning Officials. Planning: Selected Papers from the ASPO National Planning Conference. Chicago, Ill., The Society, 1943- (This title. 1909- other titles.)

10 Ewald, William R., Jr., ed. Environment for Man: The Next Fifty Years. Based upon papers presented at the American Institute of Planners Conference, Portland, Ore., August 1966. Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1967. 308 p. (Midland Book MB-102, paper).

11 California. University, Berkeley. Center for Planning and Development Research. (Working Title: The Role of Science in Environmental Planning.) Not yet published.

12 U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization. (Ribicoff Committee). Federal Role in Urban Affairs. Hearings...89th Congress, 2nd session (Aug. 15-16, 1966) Part 1 - 90th Congress, 1st session + 104 p. Appendix, (April 20-21, 22 26, 29-31, Sept. 1, 1966) Part 17. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1966-67. 6 vol.

13 U. S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee. Subcommittee on Urban Affairs. Urban America: Goals and Problems. (Joint Committee print). Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1967, 303 pp., 75 cents.

14 Wilson, James Q., ed. The Metropolitan Enigma: Inquiries into the Nature and Dimensions of America's Urban Crisis. Washington, D. C., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1967. unpaged.

14a National Research Council. Committee on Water. Alternatives in Water Management. Washington, D. C., Printing and Publishing Office. National Academy of Sciences. 2101 Constitution Avenue, 20418, 1966. 52 pp.

15 Wall, Hugo, ed. Wichita Tomorrow. A report on the Wichita Regional Conference on Local Government Problems and Policies. Wichita, Kan., The Center for Urban Studies, Wichita State University, August 1967. 124 pp., n. p.

16 Scientific American. Vol. 213, No. 3 (September 1965) "Cities".

17 Scientific American, eds. Cities. New York, Knopf, 1965, $4.95. ($2.45 paper).

18 Public Administration Review. Journal of the American Society for Public Administration, 1940- , Quarterly, $15.00/yr. 1329 Eighteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

19 Management Science. Journal of the Institute of Management Sciences. Baltimore, Md., 1954- Monthly. $20.00/yr. (Membership in the Institute at $15.00/yr. includes free subscription.) Subscriptions: The Institute..., Box 273, Pleasantville, N. Y. 10570.

20 Novick, David, ed. Program Budgeting: Program Analysis and the Federal Budget. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1965. 382 pp., $6.50.

21 Dorfman, Robert, ed. Measuring Benefits of Government Investments. Papers presented at a conference of experts held Nov. 7-9, 1963. Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution, 1965. 429 pp. $6.00 (paper $2.00).

22 Hatry, Harry P. and John F. Cotton. Program Planning for State, County, City. Washington, D. C., State-Local Finances Project of the George Washington University, (1145-19th St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036 Attn: Evelyn R. Bowie), Jan. 1967. 72 pp., $2.50.

23 Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. Urban Land Use Planning. 2nd ed., Urbana, Ill., University of Illinois Press, 1965. 498 pp., $7.95.

24 Meyerson, Martin and Edward C. Banfield. Politics, Planning and the Public Interest: The Case of Public Housing in Chicago. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1955. 353 pp., $5.95 (paper $2.45).

25 Banfield, Edward C. Big City Politics: a Comparative Guide to the Political Systems of Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, El Paso, Los Angeles, Miami, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Seattle. New York, Random House, 1965. 149 pp.

---- and James Q. Wilson. City Politics. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963. 362 pp.

----. Political Influence. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. 354 pp.

----. Urban Government; a Reader in Politics and Administration. New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. 593 pp.

26 Wilson, James Q. The Amateur Democrat; Club Politics in Three Cities. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962. 378 pp.

----. Urban Renewal; the Record and the Controversy. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1966. 683 pp.

27 The Inter-University Case Program. Nos. 1 (1951)-101 (1963). Indianapolis, Ind., Bobbs-Merrill. 50¢ - $1.50 per pamphlet.

See: Mosher, Frederick C. Governmental Reorganization. Cases and Commentary. Indianapolis, Ind., Bobbs-Merrill, 1967, 545 pp., $12. His "Introduction" and "Analytic Commentary" sections deal with the above program, and the book supplements these cases.

28 Altshuler, Alan Anthony. The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis. Ithaca, N. Y., Cornell University Press, 1965. 466 pp., $8.50.

29 Anderson, Martin Carl. The Federal Bulldozer. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1964, 272 pp., $5.95. ($2.45 paper).

30 Benevolo, Leonardo. The Origins of Modern Town Planning. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1967, 154 pp. $ 5.50.

31 Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning", American Institute of Planners. Journal. Vol. 31, No. 4 (November 1965) pp. 331-338. Also in this issue: Frieden, Bernard J., "Toward Equality of Urban Opportunity", pp. 320-330.

32 Contemporary Psychology. Journal of the American Psychological Association. 1200-17th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. 1956- , Monthly, $10.00/yr.

33 American Society of Planning Officials. Planning Advisory Service. Reports. Chicago, Ill., 1313 E. 60th Street, 1949- , price varies.

AN INDIVIDUAL REVIEW OF CURRENT PLANNING LITERATURE Exchange Bibliography No. 36

Additional copies available from:

Mrs. Mary Vance, Editor
Council of Planning Librarians
Exchange Bibliographies
Post Office Box 229
Monticello, Illinois 61856 Price per copy: $2.00

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 099245760